

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 11 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,251,048 to Kaufman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,204,807 to Odagiri et al. ("Odagiri"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

A. Claims 1-17

Kaufman does not teach or suggest a body motion detector including "a rectangular wave converting circuit that converts the detection result only when the amplitude value is within the predetermined reference range," as recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

Kaufman does not teach or suggest a body motion detector including "a rectangular wave converting circuit that converts the detection result only when the amplitude value is within the predetermined reference range," as recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

Kaufman teaches, in Fig. 1, an exercise monitoring apparatus 10 including an exercise motion detector 22, a microprocessor 14, a speech processor 18, and a pulse meter for monitoring a user's pulse. See col. 6, lines 34-40. Upon each successive repetition, the exercise motion detector 22 outputs a signal to a microprocessor 14 so that the repetition may be counted. See col. 16, lines 20-32. An alarm may be issued based on any output by the exercise motion detector 22. See col. 16, lines 20-51. Kaufman also teaches that when a heart rate is being monitored, the user can be motivated to maintain his or her pulse within a target pulse range for a predetermined period of time. See col. 16, lines 46-51.

The Office Action acknowledges that Kaufman does not teach or suggest a body motion detector including a rectangular wave converting circuit that converts the detection

result when the amplitude value is within the predetermined reference range. See page 2 of the Office Action. However, the Office Action asserts that Odagiri remedies the deficiencies of Kaufman. Notwithstanding these assertions, Odagiri does not teach or suggest a rectangular wave converting circuit that converts the detection result only when the amplitude value is within the predetermined reference range.

Odagiri teaches, in Fig. 1, a GPS receiver including a traveling pitch detecting section 101 that detects a traveling pitch of a human body. Odagiri also teaches that the traveling pitch detecting section 101 includes a pitch sensor 110, an amplifying circuit 111 for amplifying an output from the pitch sensor 110, a filter 112 for removing a high frequency component thereof, and a rectangular-wave converting circuit 113 for converting an output of the filter 112 into a rectangular wave. See col. 5, lines 36-44. Because Odagiri does not teach or suggest that the output of the filter 112 is only converted by rectangular-wave converting circuit 113 when an amplitude value of the output is within a predetermined reference range, Kaufman and Odagiri do not, alone or in permissible combination, teach or suggest the body motion detector of claims 1 and 11.

Therefore, claims 1 and 11 would not have been rendered obvious by Kaufman and Odagiri do not, alone or in permissible combination. Claims 2-10 and 12-17 variously depend from claims 1 and 11, and thus also would not have been rendered obvious by Kaufman and Odagiri do not, alone or in permissible combination, for at least the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-17 are respectfully requested.

A. Claim 18

Regarding claim 18, the Office Action again asserts that Kaufman teaches a biological/pulse reaction detection device to detect a biological reaction of a user, in monitoring the heart rate to maintain the user's pulse within a certain range. See pages 4-6 of

the Office Action, and Kaufman col. 16, lines 18-54. Therefore, the Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to calculate a reference range of the monitor based on the detected biological reaction in order to prevent dangerous heart conditions.

However, the Office Action does not specifically address the feature of "a pulse rate calculating device," as set forth in claim 18. Further, neither Kaufman nor Odagiri appear to teach or suggest that a biological/pulse reaction detection device including "a pulse rate calculating device to calculate a pulse rate of a user from the detection results of the body motion detecting device and a pulse wave detecting device." Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 18 is improper. For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-18 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Holly N. Moore
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:HNH/hs

Attachment:
Request for Continued Examination

Date: October 3, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--